



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/604,174	06/27/2000	John L. Manfredelli	MSFT-0188/154574	4724

7590 09/29/2004

Peter M Ullman  
Woodcock Washburn Kurtz Mackiewicz & Norris LLP  
One Liberty Place  
46th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19103

EXAMINER

BROWN, CHRISTOPHER J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2134	

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

3

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/604,174

Applicant(s)

MANFERDELLI ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher J Brown

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-73 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-73 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 June 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4.6.7.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-31, 49, 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, and 22 state that a computer program applies a cryptographic key to a first data. These claims also state the computer program does not require access to the cryptographic key. It is unclear how a program can apply a key without having the key. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 4, 24, 49, and 65 state that second data in some way relates to a computing device. The term "relates" is vague and unspecific. Appropriate correction is required. Claim 6 recites the limitation "the retrieval " in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Art Unit: 2134

Claims 1-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility.

As per claims 1, 22, 32, 45, and 63, These claims identify a set of actions but not a concrete product.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

**Claims 1-3, 14, 15, 16, and 21, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Graunke US 5,991,399.**

As per claims 1-3, 14, 15, 16 and 21, Graunke teaches a program applying a cryptographic public/private key pair. Graunke teaches using a public key to encrypt data

and using a private key to decrypt data, (Col 3 lines 6-20). It is inherent that the program is compiled.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 4, 5, 6, 17-20, 24, 49, 58-61 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graunke US 5,991,399, in view of Maytal US 6,715,079.**

As per claims 4, 5, 6, 24, 49, and 65, Graunke teaches a program, Graunke does not teach that the program is based on data that identifies the CPU.

Maytal teaches receiving a program with data customizing the program so that it only works on the Computer with the correct CPUID, (Col 10 lines 16-53 Fig 12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the program of Graunke with the data of Maytal because the customized program will prevent illegal copying and use without the appropriate CPUID.

As per claims 17-20 and 58-61, Graunke does not disclose downloading a program over the Internet.

Maytal teaches providing a computer program to a computer device over the Internet, (Col 10 lines 25-35).

Art Unit: 2134

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the program of Graunke with the delivery of Maytal because distribution over the Internet is cheaper and faster than other delivery methods.

**Claims 7-10, 22, 23 and 30-34, 36, 37, 43-48, 50, 51, 53, 56, 57 62, and 66-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graunke US 5,991,399, in view of Aucsmith US 5,892,899.**

As per claims 8-10, 23, and 68 Graunke does not teach diversionary computer actions. Aucsmith teaches obfuscation subprograms that are diversionary in nature, (Col 6 lines 23-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the obfuscation subprograms the original program of Graunke so that the original program is not easy to hack.

As per claim 7, 22, 30-34, 36, 37, and 43-48, 50, 51, 53, 56, 57, 62, 66, 67, 68 Graunke teaches a program applying a cryptographic public/private key pair. Graunke teaches using a public key to encrypt data and using a private key to decrypt data, (Col 3 lines 6-20). It is inherent that the program is compiled.

Graunke does not teach diversionary computer actions.

Aucsmith teaches obfuscation subprograms that are diversionary in nature, (Col 6 lines 23-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the obfuscation subprograms the original program of Graunke so that the original program is not easy to hack.

**Claims 12, 13, 28, 29, 35, 41, 42, 54, and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graunke US 5,991,399, in view of Glass US 6,553,494**

As per claims 12, 13, 28, 29, 35, 41, 42, 54, and 64 Graunke does not teach hashing.

Glass teaches obtaining a first hash, including it and creating a second hash to validate that the document has not been altered, (Col 2 lines 20-27).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add hashing to the system of Graunke so that security is increased.

**Claims 11, 25, 38, 52, 63 and 71-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graunke US 5,991,399, in view of Barton US 5,912,972**

As per claims 11, 25, 38, 52, and 71-73 Graunke does not teach error detection.

Barton teaches error detection and correction, (Col 9 lines 9-16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the error correction to the system of Graunke because the error correction would maintain the authenticity of any data it was used with.

As per claim 63, Graunke teaches a program applying a cryptographic public/private key pair. Graunke teaches using a public key to encrypt data and using a private key to decrypt data, (Col 3 lines 6-20). It is inherent that the program is compiled.

Barton teaches error detection and correction, (Col 9 lines 9-16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the error correction to the system of Graunke because the error correction would maintain the authenticity of any data it was used with.

**Claims 26, 27, 39, 40, 55, 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Graunke US 5,991,399, in view of Aucsmith US 5,892,899 in view of Johnson US 5,682,428**

As per claims 26, 27, 39, 40, 55, and 70 The prior Graunke-Aucsmith combination does not teach decrypting a program using it and then reencrypting it.

Johnson teaches decrypting a file, manipulating it and then reencrypting it, (Col 27 lines 32-37). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the encryption of Johnson to the Graunke-Aucsmith combination to increase security.

### ***Conclusion***

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher J Brown whose telephone number is (571)272-3833. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Morse can be reached on (571)272-3838. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.



Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christopher J. Brown

9/25/04



GREGORY MORSE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100